



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,148	02/28/2002	Tatsuya Ohguro	220199US2S	4941
22850	7590	07/22/2004	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			FARAHANI, DANA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2814	

DATE MAILED: 07/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/084,148

Applicant(s)

OHGURO, TATSUYA

Examiner

Dana Farahani

Art Unit

2814

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,3,7-12,14,15 and 27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 16-19 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-6,13,22,26 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 20,21 and 23-25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 4-6, 13, 22, 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nowak et al., hereinafter Nowak (US Patent 6,191,451).

Regarding claims 1, 4, 22, and 26, Nowak discloses in figure 2, a semiconductor device comprising a semiconductor substrate 150; a first conductivity type well area 130 formed in a surface area of the semiconductor substrate; a plurality of element isolation areas 20 formed in the well area; a second conductivity type semiconductor layer 136 formed at a first area of the well area (the area within the area, and at the left side, of an imaginary line drawn through the Vdd electrode down to the bottom portion of the substrate) which is isolated by the element isolation areas, the second conductivity type semiconductor layer configuring a first electrode of a capacitor; a first conductivity type semiconductor layer 138 formed in a second area of the well area (the area within the right-hand-side of the mentioned imaginary line which is drawn through the Vdd electrode), which is isolated by the element isolation areas, the first conductivity type semiconductor layer configuring a second electrode of the capacitor; and a first conductivity type low resistance area 140 provided at a base portion of the well area, which connects the above mentioned first and second area, the low resistance area having a resistive value lower than that of the well area, wherein the low resistance area is not in contact with a depletion layer of a

Art Unit: 2814

junction portion between the second conductivity type semiconductor layer and the well area, and is not in contact with a depletion layer of a junction portion between the first conductivity type semiconductor layer and the well area. Although, Nowak does not disclose the well is in contact with the element isolation areas, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the length of the isolation regions, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in size of a component. A change in size of a component is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Nowak renders obvious the claimed invention except for the impurity concentration of the low resistance area. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include these values, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Regarding claims 13 and 28, note that Nowak discloses the limitation in the claim, as discussed above with regard to claim 1, also discloses a first well area 130; a second well area 134; isolation regions 20; a first electrode, Vdd and region 136 of a second type on the first area (as defined above, in the claim 1 rejection); a second electrode 142 of the first type of the bipolar transistor (comprising regions 136, 132, 130, 134, 142, and 144) formed on the first electrode. Note also Nowak does not disclose a third electrode of the first conductivity type formed in the second area of the substrate, it would have been obvious to make another identical P+ region, and its corresponding isolation region, in the well area 30, since mere duplication of the essential

Art Unit: 2814

working parts of a device involves routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. V. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

3. Claims 7, 10-12, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nowak as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Stolmeijer et al., hereinafter Stolmeijer (U.S. 5,742,090).

Regarding claims 7, 10, and 27, Nowak discloses the limitations in these claims, as discussed above, with regard to claim 1, further disclosing a second well 134. However, Nowak does not disclose a MOS transistor.

Stolmeijer discloses in figure 5 a MOS transistor 20 in an integrated circuit. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a MOS transistor in Nowak's structure in order to make an integrated circuit application which employs both capacitors and MOS transistors (note that in claim 15 a first conductivity type semiconductor layer is one of a source/drain regions of the transistor).

Regarding claims 11 and 12, Nowak in view Stolmeijer renders obvious the claimed invention except for the impurity concentration of the low resistance area. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include these values, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 16-19 are allowed.

5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The reason for indication of allowability of claims 16-19 is inclusion therein of the limitations that of the circuitry stated in those claims.

6. Claims 20, 21, and 23-25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the primary reason for indication of allowability of claims 20, 21, and 23-25 is inclusion therein of the limitations of the third layer and the second low resistance areas.

conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dana Farahani whose telephone number is (571)272-1706. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM - 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael M Fahmy can be reached on (571)272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.

D. Farahani

LONG PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER